

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 through 8 remain pending. In response to the Office Action dated December 29, 2005, claim 2 has been cancelled, claim 1 has been amended, and a new drawing sheet is submitted. Care has been taken to avoid the introduction of new matter. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully solicited.

Objection has been made to the drawings for lacking an illustration of the configuration recited in claim 4. In response, an additional drawing sheet, including new Fig. 1C is submitted. As this figure depicts only what is required by original claim 4, no new matter is presented. The specification has been amended accordingly to describe Fig. 1C.

Claims 1 through 8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for indefiniteness. This rejection is now moot as claim 1 has been amended to require two insulated wires. The phrase “each of said one or more” has been deleted.

Claims 1 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. patent 5,463,188 (Nohmi), as applied at paragraph 5 of the Office Action. In response, claim 1 has been amended to include the recitation of now cancelled dependent claim 2. It is submitted, therefore, that claim 1 and its dependent claim 3 are no longer anticipated by Nohmi under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Claims 2 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nohmi in view of U.S. patent 6,677,534 (Yamamoto). The rejection is set forth at paragraph 8 (page 5) of the Office Action. The Office Action recognizes that Nohmi does not disclose the claimed requirement for two insulated wires having diameters not more than 0.3 mm. The Yamamoto disclosure of insulated wires having diameters of 0.21 mm was relied upon for

concluding that it would have been obvious to utilize the disclosed Yamamoto dimension for the wire diameter of Nohmi and to utilize parallel pair cables therein.

The rejection is respectfully traversed for the reason that such a substitution of diameter size for the wire of the Nohmi disclosure would not have resulted in the claimed combination. Nohmi states at column 1, lines 47-56, that the winding pitch of each transverse winding (i.e., shield layer) is to be in a range of 0.8 to 2.0 times the bending radius. In the disclosed examples of Nohmi, an insulated wire having an outer diameter of 0.7 mm and a shield cable including the insulated wire has a bending radius of 4 mm. The pitch range disclosed by Nohmi for the 4 mm bending radius is thus between  $0.8 \times 4$  and  $2.0 \times 4$ , i.e., between 2.8 and 8.

As recognized in the Office Action, the 0.7 mm diameter wire is outside the claimed range of less than 0.3 mm. Since the bending radius of a shield cable is dependent on the diameter of the insulated wire, the substitution of the 0.21 mm diameter wire of Yamamoto for the 0.7 mm diameter wire in Nohmi would result in a bending radius of considerably less than 4mm. This modification would result in a maximum pitch that is less than the claimed range of 7 to 13 mm. It is submitted, therefore, that the combined teachings of Nohmi and Yamamoto would not have suggested the invention now recited in claim 1.

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nohmi. Claims 1, 3 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 4,131,759 (Felkel) in view of Nohmi. Claims 6 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nohmi in view of U.S. patent 4,552,989 (Sass). The teachings of Nohmi considered with Felkel or Sass would not have led to the requirement of claim 2, i.e., the combination of a winding pitch of 7 to 13mm with a wire radius of less than 0.3 mm, which has been incorporated into parent claim 1.

**Application No.: 10/522,577**

Accordingly, it is submitted that claims 1 and 3 through 8 are patentably distinguishable. Allowance of the application is respectfully solicited. To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Gene Z. Robinson  
Registration No. 33,351

600 13<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005-3096  
Phone: 202.756.8000 GZR:lnm  
Facsimile: 202.756.8087  
**Date: March 29, 2006**

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277  
as our correspondence address.**

WDC99 1209646-1.050395.0314